

RECEIVED

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

04-207

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** Carl Randall [crandall@mmrplans.com]

**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2006 4:31 PM

**To:** KJMWEB

**Subject:** Unbundling cable tv services

Thanks for the possibility. Another option would let them bundle but give me the ability to block any channels I do not want to see. It's ridiculous that I have to flip through 78 channels to look at the 15 I watch.

3/3/2006

**Sandraelyn Bailey****RECEIVED**

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary**From:** Daniel W. Ridley [warren58@lcs.net]**Sent:** Saturday, February 25, 2006 2:17 PM**To:** KJMWEB**Subject:** Expanded A La Carte Options

Dear Sir,

Thank you for bringing up the issue, once again, about television viewers having the option of making their own "a la carte" choice of which channels should be brought into their home.

However, I would like to see the satellite program providers included with the cable program providers.

I initially subscribed to the Dish Network "America's Top 40" package. This package was then replaced with "America's Top 50" package, with a sizeable rate increase. This package was, in turn, replaced with "America's Top 60" package, with yet another rate increase. Yet, none of the add-on channels are of interest to me to watch. I should point out that I am fortunate to be in a prime location to receive all of the local television transmissions and do not need to buy the additional mini-package from Dish Network.

I would like to have public hearings held and all of the cable and satellite program providers submit their cost information, channel by channel. Let the American people learn which channels are being subsidized. The Booz Allen Study was grossly lacking in details.

Please don't let the lobbyists kill this effort.

With regards,

D.W. Ridley

2600 Kidwells Ridge Road

Morristown, TN 37814

3/3/2006

**Sandralyn Bailey****RECEIVED**

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**From:** DELFIUM@aol.com  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2006 4:21 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Cable Carriers & Unbundling of services

I am in favor of cable TV carriers having to unbundle their services. In my area (Cox Cable, Orange County California), Cox Cable bundles many, many Spanish language, hip-hop music, and other shows that I have absolutely no interest in subsidizing. These other stations should stand on their own or go away and not be a parasite on the good programs because they are not financially feasible stand alone. Further, when a show does reach successful "critical mass" and Cox believes it will stand on its own, it then removes it from the bundle and charges extra; it did this with Speed Channel a couple of years ago.

If ala carte is not offered, then more choices at reasonable costs need to be offered to eliminate the junk being forced into my home and stop the subsidizing of the junk.

Very truly yours,  
Gary Del Fium  
Orange County, CA

3/3/2006

**SandraLyn Bailey**

**From:** Ernest DeSoto [fbcp@pgtc.net]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2006 4:47 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

**RECEIVED**  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Ernest DeSoto (fbcp@pgtc.net) writes:

Chairman Martin,

Thank you for your support of the a la carte approach to cable subscriptions. I am a father of two children (a 10 and 9 year old). I have a cable subscription because without it, we would be unable to pick up news stations. I am constantly having to scan the channels from 1-129 looking for new or changed channels that the cable company has added to our service. Most of the channels we pay for in a bundle we have blocked and find highly offensive. We are a conservative family (not fundamentalist, anti-culture, etc) and we feel like we are in the mainstream if what many American families think. I feel that most families, given the option would prefer the a la carte approach. The channels would either stand or fall on their own merits just like is it in most other facets of our capitalistic free-market economy.

Thank you for your leadership in this area. Please continue to press forward, not allowing big business to dictate this matter. They have had their way for over 25 years now. Now it's time to give families control.

Ernest DeSoto  
Prairie Grove, Arkansas  
479-846-5664

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 69.4.204.160  
Remote IP address: 69.4.204.160

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** frankpt243@bellsouth.fcc.gov  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 28, 2006 5:29 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Frank Patris (frankpt243@bellsouth.net) writes:

TOPIC: A LA CARTE PROGRAMMING

This is to urge you to force a la carte programming on the subscription television industry, and ensure that resultant cost savings are passed to the subscriber.

I am a captive DirectTV subscriber, with no cable options.

DirectTV just raised its prices \$3/month again, or about 10% this year, over twice the purported rate of inflation.

I am forced to accept and pay for such junk as cartoon channels, MTV and its ilk, and other stuff which can only be described, in the words of Edward R. Murrow, as a "vast wasteland".

For those who enjoy this type of junk, let a hundred flowers bloom, but don't force me to pay for it.

Give me a choice as with any other commodity I purchase (which TV is).

You and your fellow commissioners need to get DirectTV et al out of the business of dictating what their customers are forced to purchase.

Thanks for your attention, respectfully Frank.

And PS: No new spectrum space to silly cellphone functions (TV, stupid games, etc.) until the spectrum needs of our emergency services are completely satisfied. 400+ emergency personnel died at the WTC because they couldn't communicate.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 70.152.236.237  
Remote IP address: 70.152.236.237

**Sandralyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Harry Hydreos [railcowboy@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2006 4:47 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Cable choices Alacarte

RECEIVED  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I want to have such a thing as choose the channels that you want from the cable company, they tell you that you have to get a package to watch only one channel that you want. I have been writing such letters to the cable company and have spoken to many others that agree. I can only hope that you pass such a law soon. I agree with the fcc.

Harry Hydreos

po box 1107

Angelus oaks, CA

92305

Home 909 7948550

cell 951 5438783

pager 909 4947000

e mail railcowboy@yahoo.com

## Sandralyn Bailey

---

**From:** Harry Hydreos [railcowboy@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2006 4:43 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Al la carte Cable

I agree with the FCC and have been writing the cable company asking for such a thing, so that I could choose only the channels that I want to watch, this should be a reality. I hope you pass such a law soon.

Harry Hydreos  
railcowboy@yahoo.com  
Home 909 794.8550  
cell 951 543.8783  
pager (909) 4947.000

**RECEIVED**  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** Jerry.Grime@perlos.com  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2006 4:33 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Violent TV

RECEIVED  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear Mr. Chairman,

I believe it is in the best interest of the American people to have the cable networks unbundle the TV shows so people can pick and choose what they want to view. This idea that the people should have to pay for poor or violent TV shows because they are bundled with the good ones is wrong! Where is our freedom to choose? Pls help pass regulations to unbundle TV on cable networks, give the people a choice!

Best Regards,  
Jerry Grime  
Tooling Project Mgr.  
Americas Region  
Perlos Texas Inc.  
Direct: 817.961.7305  
Mobile: 817.995.7326  
jerry.grime@perlos.com

\*\*\*\*\*

This email and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this email in error please notify the system manager. This message contains confidential information and is intended only for the individual named. If you are not the named addressee you should not disseminate, distribute or copy this e-mail. Please notify the sender immediately by e-mail if you have received this e-mail by mistake and delete this e-mail from your system. If you are not the intended recipient you are notified that disclosing, copying, distributing or taking any action in reliance on the contents of this information is strictly prohibited.

\*\*\*\*\*

3/3/2006



**Sandra Lyn Bailey**

---

**From:** Jim Mammoser [mammoser@bellsouth.net]  
**Sent:** Saturday, February 25, 2006 1:42 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Cable Chloice

**RECEIVED**

APR - 3 2006

Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I urge you to enact regulations requiring the cable companies to offer viewers a choice of what cable channels they want to subscribe to. The cable companies continue to avoid this option and we viewers continue to have to put up with the crap they are showing in our homes.

Please do something soon.

Jim Mammoser

**Sandralyn Bailey**

---

**From:** John Harris [johnsharris@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2006 10:40 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

**RECEIVED**  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

John Harris (johnsharris@gmail.com) writes:

Just wanted to send you a comment regarding cable a la carte possibilities: Although some in the cable industry might complain about the possible loss of revenue, I would actually spend more if I could choose what channels I wanted. Currently, I have the lowest possible pricing package. If I could pick and choose, I would spend more to get the channels I want. I am not going to spend a lot more to only get the few channels I want. Anyway, just wanted to share my opinion.

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.0  
Remote host: 199.82.243.74  
Remote IP address: 199.82.243.74

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** mike and belinda buttino [mbuttino@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, February 24, 2006 9:02 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Ala Carte Cable Viewing

**RECEIVED**  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Dear FCC,

We are 100% for Ala Carte Cable. We are tired of being forced to pay for viewing material that we feel is inappropriate and against our Religion. We are against the Filth and degradation of Women displayed on the MTV and VH1 Channels. If you choose to support this sick viewing than so be it, why are we forced to support this. There are enough pervert stations, if we went to an Ala Carte system maybe Hollywood would finally get the hint that We The People are sick of this. The Cable industry should realize that smut is everywhere, it is the clean fresh entertainment that is so lacking. We The People would gladly pay more for a package of programming that provided Edited viewing. Here is a shocker for you, I choose to be censored. Watching the movie "Overboard" a great family movie except for some butt crack shots. TBS, USA, TNT, all used to censored the butt shots out of the program. Now all 3 channels show the uncensored version, sometimes they show the censored version, how are we supposed to know which version the station is going to show? Don't I have a right to know which version. They do this with all their movies. "The Mummy", had the same issues with it. Sometimes it is edited, sometimes not. Listen to me, we do not want the unedited version coming into our home. If I want unedited movies I will subscribe to HBO. The Disney so called Family Channel shows can get pretty questionable with content at times. They may not make My Ala Carte list. Why on earth doesn't the Cable industry just offer a Family Friendly Censored Edited Program Bundle? Why No?. I want to be Censored. You don't want to be censored, that's your business. Why can't you let us view TV in peace. When Adelphia offers us free premium channels we always refuse them. We do not want uncensored movies into our house. Even a great movie like Titanic has some sections of the movie that we don't want to see. Isn't that our right to censor ourselves. It's the American way to choose and the Cable industry better get used to it.

Belinda Buttino

**SandraLyn Bailey**

---

**From:** mjbvricker@verizon.net  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 23, 2006 9:49 PM  
**To:** fmoore@ap.org  
**Cc:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** ala carte tv

**RECEIVED**  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

I disagree with the diversity propaganda and believe ala carte cable is a move forward for our children, families, and country.

It is not a matter of just changing the channel, but of paying for your own trash/entertainment.

Regards,  
Justin

<http://commerce.senate.gov/newsroom/printable.cfm?id=233682>

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** Mr.Dennis Ballard [dballard@jvlnet.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, February 27, 2006 11:11 AM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Comments to the Chairman

RECEIVED  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Mr.Dennis Ballard (dballard@jvlnet.com) writes:

Mr. Martin, Now that I'm retired I watch more cable TV. We need "choice" on cable TV. Half of the channels we receive and pay for are almost never watched. I would like to remove those from my channel line up. It is like going to the grocery store and buying some steak only to find out you must also buy some steak sauce or you can not have the steak. I wonder if the same argument would be made that if I don't buy the sauce the steak would cost more? We don't enjoy sports on TV much, but have to pay for 6 channels out of 36 of nothing but sports programs. I hope your listening! Dennis

-----  
Server protocol: HTTP/1.1  
Remote host: 216.250.11.97  
Remote IP address: 216.250.11.97

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** OTISREP@aol.com  
**Sent:** Tuesday, February 21, 2006 7:09 PM  
**To:** KJMWEB  
**Subject:** Multi-channel Television systems

RECEIVED  
 APR - 8 2006  
 Federal Communications Commission  
 Office of the Secretary

Dear Chairman Martin,

Below is the text of a column that ran in the 21 Feb 2006 (Sunday) edition of the Everett (WA) Herald. It mentions the FCC and quotes from your Congressional testimony and I thought that you might want to see it.

Sincerely,  
 James McCusker

[http://www.heraldnet.com/stories/06/02/19/100bus\\_mccusker001.cfm](http://www.heraldnet.com/stories/06/02/19/100bus_mccusker001.cfm)

#### EH060219/BUNDLE

According to the latest government data, the average person in the US watches television for 4 hours and 32 minutes each day. And for 86 percent of American households, what we watch these days is delivered to our TV sets by cable or satellite broadcasts.

Along with what we actually watch on television, of course, is a lot of stuff we never look at. For some of us that might mean the shopping channels; for others it is public broadcasting, or the sitcoms-of-yesteryear channel.

Cable and satellite companies sell their programming in "packages" that include the channels we want – along with a lot of junk that we have no interest in. And even though television viewing preferences vary widely, so that one person's junk might be another's "appointment" TV, the result is that "packaging" inevitably means that all of us end up paying for channels we don't want.

That is not an accident. One of the ways that businesses try to maximize their profit is through a process called, "bundling," and the packages sold by cable and satellite companies are a perfect example of the technique.

When it owned the automobile market, Detroit manufacturers provided some of the best known, and most egregious, examples of bundling. It was not unusual for an American-built car model to have perhaps fifteen or twenty different "packages" that bundled various options together. To get a radio with a CD player, for example, you might have to buy the "Luxury Package," which might include a lot of high-margin stuff like extra speakers, power windows, and, of course, a bigger battery to handle the extra electrical load.

Did it make sense? Not to the car buyer, of course, whose desire for a CD player left his or her checkbook \$2,578 lighter, but it made the accountants and investors happy.

Competition from Japanese-built cars, which generally arrived "fully equipped" from the factory and with few, if any, options, eventually ruined Detroit's bundling bonanza. There are still "packages" to be dealt with when buying a car but they are not nearly as annoying or as nonsensical as they once were.

Basic economic theory, and common sense, both tell us that it is not a good thing for consumers when they have to pay for stuff they don't want. And in representing consumers' interests the federal government from time to time takes action to force companies, or even entire industries, to unbundle products and services so that consumers can select and pay for what they need.

One of the largest, and longest, of these legal actions involved IBM, whose decision to separate, or unbundle, its software and support services from its hardware business had a pivotal technological and economic impact on the computer industry.

The Federal Communications Commission (FCC) has recently been taking a closer look at how our television programming reaches us – and how regulatory action might play a part in improving the system.

There are two reasons for the FCC's current interest – well, three, if you count Janet Jackson's "wardrobe malfunction." The first is that the cable television industry's market share is declining, but is still hovering around the level of market dominance where a provision in the Communications Act kicks in and allows the FCC to regulate content and structure.

The second is that the increased competition in the industry hasn't reduced costs to consumers. In its most recent "Video Competition Report," the FCC noted that "Cable operators have responded to the growth of DBS (Direct Broadcast Satellite) and other competitors by expanding service offerings rather than lowering prices charged to consumers."

What those new regulations might look like isn't certain, but since the FCC Chairman, Kevin Martin, has already indicated that he favors unbundling it is likely that it will have a prominent role in the industry's new look.

3/3/2006

Whether unbundling will mean the end of the costly and nonsensical "packages" that now characterize cable television, though, is another matter. The cable television industry is characterized by bundling not only by the cable companies themselves but also by the content providers – the networks and media agglomerates that develop and own the programs. For a cable company to get the program they want, they might have to take, and pay for, two others. Sound familiar? This structural barrier to competition has to be addressed along with unbundling at the consumer end.

There are sometimes technical reasons behind product "packages" but most bundling is motivated by profit maximization and enabled by *monopoly power*. *From an economics standpoint, in an ideal market consumers would be able to choose and pay for only the television channels they want.* That part is simple. Getting there from where we are now, though, will take some hard work. JAMES MCCUSKER - 30-

**Sandralyn Bailey**

**From:** Pat [pwann@aculink.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, February 25, 2006 10:52 AM

**To:** KJMWEB

RECEIVED  
APR - 3 2006  
Federal Communications Commission  
Office of the Secretary

Hi

I am curious about cable tv. When will the public get just the programming they want and pay for that instead of letting cable pick the package and charge outrageous prices for it when a person doesn't watch half of the channels?

I had heard that the FCC was going to start to regulate cable services but nothing has been done so far.

Patricia Wanner

Florence, Colorado

3/3/2006